



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

41

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,652	05/31/2001	Michael Anthony Sijacic	06502.0340	7976

60667 7590 06/07/2007
SUN MICROSYSTEMS/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

CUFF, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/07/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/867,652	Applicant(s) SIJACIC ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Cuff	Art Unit 3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-13 and 21-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-13 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060925</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority date of Morinville reference

Applicant did not have easy access to the parent application, 09/770,163, of CIP reference 2002/0062240, Morinville. The examiner is providing page one and figure one of the '163 application, which supports multiple management approvals for specific purchases. This action will be non-final due to the limited access to the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13 and 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Neely and Morinville.

The admitted prior art shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying a response disputing one or more line items and the specifics of the approvers from the purchasing entity.

From applicant's "background" section, conventional B2B EIPP systems allow businesses to have invoices presented, processed and paid through an intermediate service. In doing so, the intermediate service generally downloads an entire invoice from a provider of goods and/or services and enables the invoice to be managed on-line by both the provider and a purchaser. Although such services enable businesses to

perform invoice processes electronically, dispute and payment processing is limited to the entire invoice.

Neely teaches an electronic invoicing and payment system where (column 5, top) the customer may pay less (a response reflecting one line item) than the amount due on the invoice for either unspecified reasons or for a specific reason such a dispute concerning a line item contained on the invoice in order to communicate with the biller and to not pay for items not received.

Based on the teaching of Neely, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the conventional EIPP system to pay less than an invoice amount as a response to a disputed line item in order to communicate with the biller and to not pay for items not received.

Morinville teaches a signature loop authorizing method. The system assigns approval roles for certain functions. Paragraph 0069 specifically discusses the possibility "if two management levels are necessary for approval". This allows greater oversight for higher profile decisions.

Based on the teaching of Morinville, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the conventional EIPP system to incorporate authorization procedures for different actions including a second approval on some line items in order to allow greater oversight for higher profile decisions.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the examiner has not shown enough relevance of the references. The examiner does not concur. The explanation provided makes the pertinence of each reference apparent.

Applicant asserts that a "customer" cannot correspond to multiple approvers. The examiner does not concur. The "customer" is a business with more than one person.

Applicant asserts that the prior art does not show a second processing entity. The examiner does not concur. The second approver is the second processing entity.

Applicant asserts that Neely fails to disclose any "dispute resolution process for line items. The examiner does not concur. The rejection and the reference clearly show this.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3627

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Cuff" followed by the date "5/29/07".

MICHAEL CUFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Michael Cuff
May 29, 2007